

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

JERMAINE CRAWFORD,)	CASE NO. 1:14CV01954
Petitioner,)	
v.)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
WARDEN LAZAROFF,)	
Respondent.)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND</u>
		<u>ORDER</u>

Pro se Petitioner Jermaine Crawford filed a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 2254](#) (ECF No. [1](#)), alleging four grounds for relief which challenge the constitutional sufficiency of his conviction for the lesser included offense of felony murder and for aggravated robbery. The state trial court sentenced Petitioner to an aggregate term of incarceration of twenty years to life. On September 24, 2014, the case was referred to Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr. for preparation of a report and recommendation pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636](#) and [Local Rule 72.2\(b\)\(2\)](#). On January 14, 2016, the magistrate judge submitted a report and recommendation (ECF No. [8](#)) recommending that the petition be dismissed in part and denied in part.

[Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(b\)\(2\)](#) provides that objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within 14 days after service. Objections to the magistrate judge's Report were, therefore, due on February 1, 2016.¹ Petitioner has not filed any objections to the magistrate judge's report

¹ Under [Fed. R. Civ. P. 6\(d\)](#), three days must be added to the fourteen-day time period because Petitioner was served the Magistrate Judge's Report by mail. See [Thompson v.](#)

(1:14CV01954)

and recommendation. Any further review by the Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, [474 U.S. 140 \(1985\)](#); *Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981). Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation. Petitioner Jermaine Crawford's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is dismissed in part and denied in part.

The Court certifies, pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(a\)\(3\)](#), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\); Fed. R. App. P. 22\(b\)](#).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 29, 2016
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson
Benita Y. Pearson
United States District Judge

[Chandler](#), 36 F. App'x. 783, 784 (6th Cir. 2002).